



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/650,444	08/28/2003	Hiroko Mano	RCOH-1065	6735

7590 03/07/2006

KNOBLE & YOSHIDA, LLC
Eight Penn Center, Suite 1350
1628 John F. Kennedy Blvd.
Philadelphia, PA 19103

EXAMINER

TIMBLIN, ROBERT M

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2167

DATE MAILED: 03/07/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/650,444

Applicant(s)

MANO ET AL.

Examiner

Robert M. Timblin

Art Unit

2167

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 August 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-66 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-66 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 20 February 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This office action is in response to application 10/650/444 filed 8/28/2003.

Claims 1-66 have been examined and are pending.

Priority

Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d). The certified copy has been filed in parent Application No. 2002-250281, filed on 8/29/2002.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-14, 23-36, and 45-58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Driscoll** (US Patent 6,642,502) in view of **Cragun et al.** ('Cragun' hereinafter) (US 2003/0055810).

With respect to claims 1, 23, and 45 **Driscoll** teaches '**inputting text data**' as a user query (col. 5 lines 61-64 and figure 3) '**parsing the text data into word candidates**' as list of words used (col. 6, lines 1-5 and figure 5).

'removing predetermined words from the word candidates' as words not used (col. 5 line 66 to col. 6, line 5 and figure 4).

'determining a specific area occurrence value of each of the word candidates in the specified area in the predetermined text database' as an IDF (terminology section in column 5, column 6, lines 12-30 and figure 7).

Driscoll fails to teach specifying an area of a predetermined text database.

Cragun, however, teaches **'specifying an area of a predetermined text database'** as weight criteria, which require that the one or more search terms are located in a section (0013).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the data processing art at the time of the present invention to combine the teachings of the cited references because the teaching of **Cragun** would have provided Driscoll's system with locating terms in a section of a candidate document (0013). This teaching would further specify each small piece of text to search in Driscoll's system (abstract of Driscoll).

With respect to claims 2, 4, 24, 26, 46, 48, Driscoll fails to teach **'the specified area is a header area'** or **'the specified area is a summary area'**

Cragun, however, teaches these limitations as the weight criterion, HEADER and SUMMARY (0013, 0040, and 0043).

With respect to claims 3, 5, 7, 8, 29, 25, 27, 30, 47, 49, 51, and 52 **Driscoll** teaches **'the specific area occurrence value'** as N/DOCS (terminology section of column 5, and column 6, lines 12-25, and figure 7).

With respect to claims 6, 28, and 50, **Driscoll** teaches **'the specified area is a combination of a header area and a summary area'** as selected small pieces of text (claim 1 (a)).

With respect to claims 9, 10 31, 32, and 53, and 54 **Driscoll** teaches **'determining a search word significance value'** as the equation in fig. 2, blocks 425 and 455. **Driscoll** further teaches **'a corresponding predetermined word weight'** as each word in both the search query and in the documents are given weighted values (abstract).

With respect to claim 11, 33, and 55 **Driscoll** teaches **'selecting search words from the word candidates based upon the specific area occurrence value'** as SIM (col. 6, line 58 to col. 8, line 31, and figures 9a-9e).

'extracting sentences from the predetermined text database based upon the selected search words' as retrieving relevant documents (col. 3, lines 5-10).

With respect to claims 12, 34, and 56, **Driscoll** teaches **'selecting keywords from the word candidates based upon the specific area occurrence value'** (col. 8, lines 45-53 and figures 9a-9e).

With respect to claims 13, 35, and 57, the limitations of these claims are rejected for the same reason as those of claims 12, 34, and 56 as set forth above. Furthermore, **Driscoll** teaches **'generating a summary from the predetermined text database based upon the selected keywords'** (figures 7, and 9a-9e)

With respect to claims 14, 36, and 58, **Driscoll** teaches **'selecting classification keywords from the word candidates based upon the specific area occurrence value'** as word categories of figure 8.

'classifying the predetermined text database based upon the selected classification keywords' as word categories of figures 9a-9e.

Claims 15-22, 37-44, and 59-66 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of **Driscoll/Cragun** as applied to claims 1-14, 23-36, above and further in view of **Imaichi et al.** ('Imaichi' hereinafter) (US 2002/0184186A1).

With respect to claims 15, 37, and 59, the limitations of these claims have been rejected for the same reasons as the preceding claims as set forth above.

Furthermore, the combination of Driscoll/Cragun fails to teach the claimed limitations of determining a first text database occurrence value of the word candidates in a first text database, determining a second text database occurrence value of the word candidates in a second text database and determining a database occurrence value.

Imaichi, however, teaches **'determining a first text database occurrence value of the word candidates in a first text database and determining a second text database occurrence value of the word candidates in a second text database'** as searching a group of documents having a degree of correlation (0036-0038). Furthermore, there are multiple databases to be searched (0046 and figs. 1, 3 and 5).

'determining a database occurrence value' as frequencies are totaled from documents (0036-0037, and figure 5).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the data processing art at the time of the present invention to combine the teachings of the cited references because the teachings of Imaichi would have provided the combination of Driscoll/Cragun's system with enabling a user to execute a document search by investigating correlation between the groups of documents while switching a plurality of document databases different in kind (Imaichi, 0007).

With respect to claims 16, 17, 20, 21, 38, 39, 42, 43, 60, 61, 64 and 65 the limitations of these claims have been rejected for the same reasons as the claims set forth above.

Furthermore, it would have been obvious in light of the combination of **Driscoll/Cragun** to modify the '**database occurrence value equation**' as to produce different outcomes.

With respect to claims 18, 22, 40, 44 and 62, and 66, these claims have been rejected for the same reasons as claims 9, 10, 31, 32, and 53, and 54 as set forth above.

The combination of **Driscoll/Cragun** does not teach database occurrence value.

Imaichi, however, teaches a '**database occurrence value**' as frequencies are totaled from documents (0036-0037, and figure 5).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the data processing art at the time of the present invention to combine the teachings of the cited references because the teachings of **Imaichi** would have provided the combination of **Driscoll/Cragun**'s system with enabling a user to execute a document search by investigating correlation between the groups of documents while switching a plurality of document databases different in kind (**Imaichi**, 0007).

With respect to claims 19, 41, and 63, the limitations of these claims are similar to that of claims 1, 23, and 45 as set forth above. Therefore, these claims are rejected for the same reasons as the above claims. Furthermore, the combination of **Driscoll/Cragun** fails to teach the claimed limitations of determining a first text database occurrence value of the word candidates in a first text database, determining a second

text database occurrence value of the word candidates in a second text database and determining a database occurrence value.

Imaichi, however, teaches **'determining a first text database occurrence value of the word candidates in a first text database and determining a second text database occurrence value of the word candidates in a second text database'** as searching a group of documents having a degree of correlation (0036-0038).

Furthermore, there are multiple databases to be searched (0046 and figs. 1, 3 and 5).

'determining a database occurrence value' as frequencies are totaled from documents (0036-0037, and figure 5).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the data processing art at the time of the present invention to combine the teachings of the cited references because the teachings of Imaichi would have provided the combination of Driscoll/Cragun's system with enabling a user to execute a document search by investigating correlation between the groups of documents while switching a plurality of document databases different in kind (**Imaichi**, 0007).

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

US 2003/0097375 A1 filed by **Pennock et al.** 11/16/02. The subject matter disclosed therein is pertinent to that of claims 1-66 (i.e. measuring word occurrences).

US 5,895,464 issued to **Bhandari et al.** on 4/20/1999. The subject matter disclosed therein is pertinent to that of claims 1-66 (i.e. querying databases).

US 5,576,954 issued to **Driscoll** on 11/19/1996. The subject matter disclosed therein is pertinent to that of claims 1-66 (i.e. searching collections of documents).

US 5,991,755 issued to **Noguchi et al.** on 11/23/1999. The subject matter disclosed therein is pertinent to that of claims 1-66 (i.e. word occurrence frequencies).

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert M. Timblin whose telephone number is 571-272-5627. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00-4:30.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jean R. Homere can be reached on 571-272-3780. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Robert M. Timblin

Patent Examiner AU - 2167

RMT
3/2/06



Leslie Wong
Primary Examiner